



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/659,999	09/12/2000	Masahiro Umeshita	SOHSH8.001AUS	6327

20995 7590 12/20/2001

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SIXTEENTH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

LEON, EDWIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/659,999

Applicant(s)

UMESHITA ET AL.

Examiner

Edwin A. León

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed September 18, 2001 in which Claims 1 and 7 have been amended, has been placed of record in the file as Paper No. 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urani (U.S. Patent 4,391,485) in view of Takano (U.S. Patent No. 5,447,452). With regard to Claims 1 and 7, Urani discloses a fuse connection box (10) comprising a fuse (16) and a housing (12), the housing (12) being divided into a first side housing (14) in which a first side terminal (38) of an end of a first side wire (18) is assembled, and a second side housing (14) in which a second side terminal (38) of an end of a second side wire (18) is assembled, the first side housing (14) and second side housing (14) having portions (22,24,26,32,34,36) for engagement with each other, and the first side housing (14) and second side housing (14) being engaged to form a single housing (12).

in which the fuse (16) can be attached. The method limitations are deemed inherent.

See Figs. 1-4.

Urani doesn't show the first and second housings being separately pre-assembled with the first and second wires.

Takano discloses a connection box having first and second housings (1) being separately pre-assembled with first and second wires (6). See Figs. 1-3.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the connection box of Urani by including first and second housings being separately pre-assembled with first and second wires as taught in Takano to simplify the assembling process and make it more efficient.

With regard to Claim 2, Urani discloses the first side housing (14) and the second side housing (14) are of identical shapes having first engagement portions (22,24,26) at one end in the direction of arrangement of fuses (16) and having second engagement portions (32,34,36) of shapes engaging with the first engagement portions (22,24,26) at the other end. See Figs. 1-4.

4. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urani (U.S. Patent 4,391,485) in view of Takano (U.S. Patent No. 5,447,452) and Call (U.S. Patent 4,758,184). With regard to Claim 3-6, the combination of Urani and Takano disclose the claimed invention except a protective cover having a protective frame.

Call discloses a fuse connection box (10) comprising a protective cover (20) having a protective frame (23) attached to a first side housing (42) and second side

Art Unit: 2833

housing (40) so as to cover a fuse (52) in a state where the first side housing (42) and the second side housing (42) are connected and the fuse (52) attached. See Figs. 1-5.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to modify the connection box of Urani by including a protective cover having a frame as taught in Call to make the box resistant to vibration and rough use.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed September 18, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument regarding Claims 1 and 7 that the references do not show the first and second housings being separately pre-assembled with the first and second wires, Applicant is reminded that this limitation was not recited in the original claims. A new rejection has been done in which it is clearly explained that the Takano discloses this new limitation and in combination with the applied references meet Applicant's claims.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edwin A. León whose telephone number is (703) 308-6253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

